Placer County

Wastewater Advisory Committee

County Environmental Health ◆ 3091 County Center Dr. Suite 180 ◆ Auburn, CA 95603

MINUTES

October 06, 2009

CDRA Cypress Room

I. Call to Order

A Guy Ostenson called the meeting to order at 4:40 p.m.

II. Preliminary Items

A Roll Call and Determination of Quorum

Chris White, Marc Lindbloom, David Honeycutt, Mike Broyer, Bill Carpenter, Guy Ostenson, Rick Bluhm, Dave Buck, and Mark Navo were present. Dave Spannagel, Kevin Bell, Tibor Banathy, and Ken Denio were absent. A quorum was established.

B Introduction of Guests

Rick McCauley, Marilyn Jasper, and Joe Olsen attended as guests. Leslie Lindbo, Mohan Ganapathy, Vicki Ramsey and Marci Branaugh attended the meeting representing Environmental Health.

Minutes Review

Rick Bluhm made a motion to accept the minutes as written from the August 04, 2009 meeting, the motion was seconded.

The vote was all in favor and no opposing votes.

C Agenda Review

III. Action Items

Review of On-site Sewage Manual Draft Revisions

Chapter 34 to end (Attached), Note: Chapter 41 (Definitions) has already been reviewed.

Chapter 34. Effluent Pump, Control, and Alarm Materials and Construction

Discussion– B.4. Cartridge Filters, EH to consider effluent screen for pump to standard systems instead of pump screens. EH to consider specifications and certifications for mesh on effluent screens. Guy requested that EH consider the overall costs, what the

purpose of it is and how we can achieve that without increased costs to the homeowner.

Discussion – How this is interpreted for Proprietary Systems, EH will add is wording "unless otherwise approved through Proprietary System Approval"

CHANGES

B. Pumps, Controls, and Alarms, 9 & 10.
Change electrical box to control panel.

Chapter 35. Off-Grid Power Supply

CHANGES

A. General Statement,
Add "a" in front of public utility.
B. Criteria for Approval,
Add "eg" in front of (PG&E)

Chapter 36. Pipe Materials and Construction

Discussion, B. Building Sewer Pipe – It was questioned again about having the EH sign off on the sewer pipe instead of the Building Department because EH is already out there and having to have Building come out to inspect just that pipe is a waste of County time and tax payers dollars. Leslie has already approached the Building Department regarding this, and was not able to come to an agreement. Building suggested that EH would need to get some sort of International Plumbing Code Certification in order to do this. EH will approach the Building Department again and look into proposing a specific length of building sewer pipe that will be inspected by EH and putting it into the building permit sign off then it would be up to Building Department from there.

Chapter 37. Vault Privy and Portable Toilet Materials and Construction

CHANGES

B. Additional Provisions for Vault Privy Shelters
Remove In addition to complying with the requirements of Chapter 34,

C. Additional Provisions for Portable Toilet Shelters
Remove In addition to complying with the requirements of Chapter 34,

E. Additional Provisions for Vault Privy Facilities

Find a more suitable word than "caustic."

F. Additional Provisions for Portable Toilet Facilities
Remove In addition to complying with the requirements of Chapter 34,

Chapter 38. Reconstruction of Fire Damaged Residential Structures

Discussion, A. The requirements of the Chapter shall apply to the reconstruction of a fire damaged residential structure done within a specified amount of time.

Discussion, 1A&B – Change requirement that the system must be less than twenty (20) years old to making the proposed language for "Authorization Notice."

Discussion, Title – Discussion: This Chapter should address more than fire damage. It should include other disaster situations such as flood or earthquake. EH to propose language to include a broader scope of situations where this Chapter could apply.

CHANGES

A. The requirements of the Chapter shall apply to the reconstruction of a fire damaged residential structure, 1-a.
Strike ~~Septic~~

Chapter 39. Artificial Drain Design, Materials and Construction

Discussion C1: The filter fabric, when required to envelope the entire drain, creates a problem with water flow. Recommend rephrasing to require filter material just on top before backfilling.

It was recommended to add the ability to use artificial aggregate products.

CHANGES

Add something about artificial aggregate products such as easy flow to this chapter.

A. General Statement
Add "away" in front of from

C. Design, Construction, and Materials Requirements for Artificial Drains, 1
Rephrase

C. Design, Construction, and Materials Requirements for Artificial Drains, 2

Replace the word trench with the word drain.

D. Discharge Outflow, 5

Strike ~~100% replacement~~.

Add wording "down grade"

Renumber the paragraphs for this part.

Chapter 40. Tables

TABLE 1

CHANGES

4th Box Down, Water Canals – WAC questioned whether lined and unlined water canals be differentiated?

5th Box Down, Cuts Manmade - EH will look into the 20' setback to see if it is too excessive.

7th Box Down, Foundation Lines - Would like the option to place tank in the paved area.

9th & 10th Box Down, All Water Lines & Easements – Clarify the type of easement because depending on the type it may have a setback.

Regional Board does not acknowledge the difference in leach fields with highly treated effluent compared to untreated effluent when it comes to the horizontal setbacks.

Correct the numbering on the footnotes.

Add another footnote to allow installation in the paved area.

Footnote 1 – The "mean yearly high water mark" is difficult to determine. Chris White will report back on better wording for this footnote; possible something that can be determined in the field.

Footnote 2 – Add the word "natural"

Footnote 3 - Change the verbiage to match the verbiage in D5.

Footnote 8 – EH will consult with the Building Department and look into possibly rephrasing.

Footnote 9 - Clarify the type of easement.

TABLE 2

There was a suggestion to document where these numbers come from, EH will check with the EPA book.

Add winery waste

Chapter 42. Fees

No Changes

Completion of Review of the Revisions to Manual

The review of the revisions to the manual has been completed; EH will have a rough draft to give to the committee with the incorporated changes by the January meeting for the committee review.

B. Pretreatment Unit Disinfection

The WAC to make a recommendation to EHS regarding the following requests

- Consider a request by Bill Carpenter to have the WAC take a vote to make a recommendation to the Environmental Health Director on the subject of allowing pretreatment unit manufacturers to specify the type of disinfection system they use in their units, and not allow EHS to specify the brand or model of the device.

  Discussion:

  For ore-treatment manufacturers that are in the experimental program, the disinfection requirement is part of the conditions of approval so any vote made today would not change those conditions.

  If the manufacturer was allowed to make changes without approval EH would have no ability to even know what's in the unit and as far as an experimental program we are evaluating the effectiveness of units and if they are changed without any kind notice or approval it defeats the purpose of an experimental program.

  EH needs scientific data showing the performance of the proposed disinfection system. Prior to approval, the manufacturer needs to provide supporting scientific documentation that this system works. If no data is provided then no decision can be made as to its effectiveness and the application cannot go forward. Guidelines are in place (for the experimental system program) that testing (prior to application)

needs to be done. It's been done on these other units (in the experimental system program). If you don't have this data, can't prove that it works.

Bill's argument is that ATU's actually perform better than Sand-filters and sand-filters do not have disinfection requirements.

The basis of approval of the experimental system program was so that effluent quality from experimental systems would mimic that of the sand filter. This is because the State allowed our sand filter program with 18 inches of vertical separation and so forth. So for the experimental system program, any system that came into the County that can demonstrate effluent quality that is equal or better than sand filter quality standards, than we are going to approve it. So the ATUs that applied for the experimental system program came in with very good BOD, TSS, however the coliform levels were high. So we allowed the use of the Salcor for disinfection to bring the coliform levels down to that of the sand filter effluent standards. That's the whole basis of requiring disinfection. If the system demonstrates that the ATU can bring the fecal coliform levels down to sand filter quality standards without disinfection, then they don't need to use disinfection.

Is there a health hazard if you are distributing the effluent into soil? How deep does the soil need to be to say it's not a health risk? Do we need to have fecal coliform at this amount (demonstrated sand filter quality) to not present a health hazard? This is something that the staff has not provided an answer for. Effluent doesn't have to meet Title 22 standards.

EHS must work within the guidelines of the State Waterboard. Since they've allowed Sand Filter Systems for which there are documented performance results, to be used where there is only 18 inches of soil, in allowing all these other systems we must require similar performance results in order to be in compliance with the State.

Then why not require all sand filter systems must be sampled? If a study showed all sand filter system meet these standards then they don't need to be sampled. But samples that were taken showed a range of results. Therefore sand filters need to have disinfection.

From 2005 they are required to have OM & M services. EH agreed that without proper maintenance sand filter systems will not perform as designed the same goes

for the ATU's. EH agreed those sand filter systems that were sampled showed a range of results. EH proposed that a recommendation can be made that all sand filter systems should be sampled.

This is a slippery slope, where does it end – will all systems eventually need to be sampled? Will we need to go back and retrofit old systems?

Bill withdrew his request for a vote.

- Consider a Request by Bill Carpenter to use his own UV disinfection system rather than Salcor in the Envirocycle unit.

  However Salcor is the only disinfection system that is approved by the County.

  Bill withdrew his request pending information from his counsel.

- Consider a request by Guy Ostenson to use Norweco Singulair UV disinfection instead of chlorination/de-chlorination in the Singulair pretreatment unit.

  Discussion:

  History was presented by Guy Ostenson: Singulair has been using chlorinator/dechlorinator in the Singulair System – has not functioned as well as hoped – it works, but cost because of maintenance it is not feasible because is more frequent maintenance visits. The tablets gets soft and deformed and don't drop down the tubes.

  Norweco came out with a new UV light that Guy likes better than Salcor. Salcor was tested through NSF, the Norweco light was reviewed and compared to the Salcor light. NSF stated they could not see any design difference that the Norweco light would perform less effectively than Salcor. The Norweco unit has better water-tight wiring.

  Does Singulair's scope of approval allow for UV? Yes, it simply says it must use a method of disinfection approved by the Environmental Health Director. It was recommended that all experimental systems have this language rather than specifying a specific type of disinfection method.

Guy stepped down as Chair of the committee and Rick Bluhm assumed the seat of Chair during further discussion and the vote.

Further Discussion:

Clarity warranted: Approval is based on expectation of similar performance.

WAC was not presented with performance data of the Norweco unit, but presented with a letter from NSF that the system was evaluated and compared to the Salcor unit and found that it is predicted to perform at least as well as the Salcor unit.

Guy further clarifies he doesn't want to replace the chlorinator/dechlorinator systems currently in place – just wants to stop using it for new systems.

Motion by Mike Broyer: Recommend to the Director of Environmental Health the approval of the Norweco UV system as an alternative to the Norweco Chlorinator/Dechlorinator. Mark Navo seconded.

Voted: All in favor none opposed.

IV. Non-Action Items

A. Correspondence and Public Comment

1. Letter from Mr. Carpenter to the Placer County Board of Supervisors Concerning On-site Sewage Ordinance Revisions

Discussion: It was inappropriate for Bill to name himself as a member of the Committee because it sounds like he is talking as representing the Committee.

Bill clarified the letter was on personal stationary and he is a member.

B. Legislative Update: None

V. Agenda Preparation for Next Meeting

Date: November 3, 2009
Location: Cypress room at the CDRC
Time: 4:30 PM to 6:00 PM.

Proposed Action Items:

- Systems in Steep Slopes
- Sizing Criteria

- Performance of the systems in the experimental systems program
- Ron Beam from Georgetown Precast to comment on the requirements IAPMO tank certifications
- EH inspection of building sewer.

VI. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 PM